

2nd March 1925]

(b) In the case of the following seven local bodies the Government declined to sanction the payment of the contributions :—

- (1) Walluvanad Taluk Board.
- (2) Salem Taluk Board.
- (3) Tirupattur Municipal Council.
- (4) Chandragiri Taluk Board.
- (5) Tirutturaipundi Taluk Board.
- (6) Bhimavaram Taluk Board.
- (7) Cocanada Taluk Board.

(c) In the first four cases referred to in the answer to clause (b) above the finances of the local bodies were not satisfactory. In the other three cases the contributions were proposed to be given to individual persons or to funds in whose case there was no guarantee that the amount contributed will be spent on flood relief in South India.

(d) Yes. There was no guarantee that the amount will be spent on flood relief in South India.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ With reference to answer in clause (a) referring to appendix II on page 32, may I ask the hon. the Minister whether all those contributions were made to the Central Flood Relief Fund with the sanction of the Local Government? I am talking of the local boards who were permitted to make contributions.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I should have notice of the question.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ With reference to answer to clause (c) of this question ‘ In the other three cases the contributions were proposed to be given to individual persons or to funds in whose case there was no guarantee that the amount contributed will be spent on flood relief in South India ’, may I ask what are those funds in whose case there was no guarantee? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I should like to have notice of this too.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ With reference to clause (d) of this question, and the answer thereto, may I ask the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government whether he is responsible for the statement that with regard to the People's Flood Relief Fund of which Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar, the ex-Advocate-General, and three hon. Members of this Council are secretaries, there is no guarantee that the amount will be spent on flood relief in South India? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ That is the opinion of the Government? ”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I ask the grounds for that opinion? ”

Alleged order by the Collector of Madura regarding cheque signed by the Chairman of the Dindigul municipality.

* 243 Q.—Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Collector of Madura ordered, in May or June last, the Sub-Treasury Officer in Dindigul not to honour any cheque

[2nd March 1925]

bearing the signature of the Chairman of the Dindigul Municipal Council, Mr. M. J. Muhammad Meera Sahib, and the Postal Department to withhold delivery of the office tapals to the said Chairman ;

(b) the authority under which the Collector acted ;

(c) whether the Government received any communication from the Collector of Madura to withdraw from the Dindigul Municipal Council the privilege of electing its Chairman which it enjoyed for nearly four decades ; and

(d) to lay on the table the entire correspondence that passed between the Government and the Collector and the said Municipal Council on the question of disenfranchising the Council of the privilege of electing its Chairman ?

A.—(a) The Government have no information.

(b) The question does not arise.

(c) & (d) No useful purpose will be served by furnishing the information or by laying the papers on the table.

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ With reference to clause (a), may I ask the Chief Minister to call for the information ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I do not think any good purpose will be served by calling for the information.”

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ In view of the fact that the allegations are of an important character, may I ask whether such action as was taken by the Collector has his approval ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I have already answered the question. I do not think there is any use in calling for the information.”

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Is not that matter, viz., issuing instructions not to honour any cheque bearing the signature of the Chairman and to withhold delivery of the office tapals to him, of sufficient importance justifying the calling for information ? ”

Representation of depressed classes in the local boards of the Ganjam district.

* 244 Q.—MR. R. VEERIAN : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any representative of the untouchable classes in the taluk boards of Chatrapur, Berhampur and Ghumsur in the Ganjam district ;

(b) if the answer be in the affirmative, the names of those gentlemen ;

(c) whether any resolution of the Chatrapur taluk board was submitted to the Government to the effect that the claims of the untouchable classes and other unrepresentative communities have been ignored in making nominations ;

(d) whether the Government have already inquired into the question as stated in the resolution submitted by the Chatrapur taluk board ;

(e) whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table the letter of the District Collector, Ganjam, regarding the availability of untouchable classes to represent the depressed and unrepresented classes in the above boards ;